DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 932 IR 013 317

AUTHOR Gustafson, Kent L.; Schuller, Charles F.
TITLE Professional Education in Instructional Development at Michigan State University.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 11p.; In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art, II; see IR 013 273. For volume I, see ED 292 444.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Centers; Curriculum Development; *Educational Media; Futures (of Society); *Graduate School Faculty; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; *Professional Education
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan State University

ABSTRACT

This chapter describes the history and philosophy of the professional preparation program for instructional developers at Michigan State University (MSU). The history of the program is traced from the establishment of the MSU Audiovisual Center in 1952 through the Joint Film Catalog and the NDEA (National Defense Education Act) Fellowships in the 1960s, to the Brazil Project for the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Educational Development Program of the late 1960s. The program's history in the 1970s is then detailed, including the evolution of formal coursework in instructional development, the University Consortium for Instructional Development and Technology, and the Instructional Development Curriculum. The current program, its underlying philosophy, and future developments are considered, and the relationship of these developments to the instructional development profession and to other branches of education are discussed. (Author/EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED298932

Chapter 44

Professional Education in Instructional Development at Michigan State University

Kent L. Gustafson
Charles F. Schuller

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charles Dills
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Michigan State University has a reputation for being a school which has a very strong educational media orientation for its instructional development program. This chapter chronicles the growth of the program at MSU, describes the current state of the program, and lays out future prospectives for the program.

PART I
THE PAST--HOW WE CAME INTO BEING AND DEVELOPED INTO WHAT WE ARE

MSU AV Center Establishment, 1952

The Audio-Visual Center at Michigan State University came about as a result of faculty demand. The Basic College, one of the more progressive units of the institution, appointed a committee in 1949 to study the matter of needed audiovisual services. Within a year, a university-wide committee was appointed by Dr. William Combs, Assistant to the President and Dean of the University Services Division (which then included the Library, the University Museum and several other agencies). The latter committee found some difficulty in agreeing upon exactly the kinds of services to be provided--other than a campus projection service and a graphics production service. They eventually agreed to bring in a professional director and charge him with the responsibility of planning and implementing the development of AV services for the university as a whole. The co-author of this chapter, Charles F. Schuller, of AV Services, assumed this position as of February 1, 1972, moving from his former position as Assistant Director of the Bureau of Visual Instruction at the University of Wisconsin.

At that time at MSU there were several hundred 16mm films for distribution to Agriculture Extension Agents, housed in Information Services, plus a few small collections of films in perhaps a half dozen university departments around campus. Projection services were provided through the Electric Shop, where perhaps eight or ten 16-mm projectors were housed and maintained. When a department wanted a film shown they had to pay an electrician to bring in a projector and run it.

At the outset, Dr. Schuller had indicated interest in the position only if faculty rank in the College of Education were provided, along with an opportunity to teach audiovisual courses. He also found agreement in the Committee that the underlying function of the Audiovisual Center would be to improve instruction in the University. Though what this meant specifically was not too clear, it could not be argued with and served as a philosophical basis for much later development. In short, the underlying function of the Audiovisual Center from the beginning was understood to be more than just that of a "service" department.

At the Director's request, an Advisory Committee to the Audiovisual Center was formed early on, consisting of a number of members of the original committees and widely representative of

IR013317

the colleges and departments of the university. This Committee met regularly for a time to discuss plans and matters of policy relative to long-range planning, the establishment of the film library to serve the university and schools in the state, and the establishment of a graphics section. Besides being interested and helpful to a new director seeking their counsel, the committee members served an excellent communications function, feeding information back into their respective departments and to the administration of the university.

After two or three years, once a sound program had been started, and after discussing the matter individually with all of its members, the Advisory Committee was officially discharged. While this termination could have been interpreted negatively, such was not the case. By that time most policies and plans had been well established along with a mutual feeling of confidence between the Director and members of the Committee. Furthermore, most members of the Committee were senior professors or administrators and all had numerous other committee assignments. Accordingly, they were pleased at being relieved of further direct responsibility--particularly since most such committees usually continue ad-infinitum. Furthermore, the Director continued to consult with several of the former members from time to time when steps of significance were under consideration.

During the first several years of its existence, the AV Center increased its staff and equipment for campus services, established a graphics section, and laid the groundwork for establishing a film library. The film library took a year or two of careful planning and persuasion. The fact that the State of Michigan, with two and a half times the population of Wisconsin, had something less than half of the film library capacity then existing at the University of Wisconsin and available to Wisconsin schools, was a fundamental factor. Yet the groundwork had to be laid carefully. It happened that Dr. Schuller had become acquainted with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. William Thurston. After a series of conferences with him and his staff, the Superintendent addressed a letter to President Hannah of Michigan State University indicating his support of the state's need for additional film library services at MSU.

An additional argument lay in the fact that although there were several minor collections of instructional films on the campus, there were none for the College of Education, which was preparing a majority of the new teachers for Michigan schools. A further consideration was the fact that most of the university's departments had limited access to films for their own instructional programs. In individual conferences with each of the some 85 department heads, the Director ascertained that practically all would favor a library on campus containing films recommended by their own faculty members. Thus, over time a sufficiently strong case was built for establishing a new film library at MSU to serve the needs both of the university's instructional programs and those of the schools and other educational agencies of the State of Michigan. Sufficient funds were provided for initial film purchases and staff, and the MSU film library began operating during the 1954-1955 academic year.

Joint Film Catalog With the University of Michigan

After several years of independent operation, arrangements were made with the University of Michigan to produce a joint catalog and improved services to the clients of both film libraries. Details are unimportant here beyond pointing out that this was one of the first examples of inter-institutional cooperation among the State's institutions of higher learning. It came at a time when the Michigan legislature and various taxpayer associations were highly critical of duplication of programs and functions among the state's colleges and universities. (It is interesting to note that for several years after its inception, a current edition of the UM/MSU catalog of instructional films was prominently displayed in President Hannah's reception room.)

Instructional Program

Within a year or two of the establishment of the Audiovisual Center in 1952, the Director began teaching classes for in-service teachers in Audiovisual Materials in Teaching. The College of Education was glad to have course offerings in Audiovisual Instruction, so no difficulty was experienced in getting initial approval. A few courses were taught on campus and in-service courses offered through Continuing Education were given around the state. Initially the Director did all of the teaching, but as new staff members came on board both course offerings and the number of classes gradually expanded. At the beginning, offerings were incorporated within the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum and a few students began to obtain Master's Degrees with a special field in Audiovisual Instruction. In addition, students from other colleges and departments of the university began enrolling for classes and two or three doctoral candidates had completed their work with a special field in Audiovisual Instruction before a major surge in advanced graduate enrollment took place in the early 1960s with the advent of the NDEA Fellowships.

In the interim, each new faculty/staff member employed in the Center was selected on the basis of two criteria. The first was strong teaching experience and qualification to teach media courses in the College of Education. The second was expertise in a particular specialty, such as graphics, film production or administration of media programs. During the early years, all IMC

professionals received faculty rank in the College of Education and were given a variety of administrative and instructional responsibilities. This was in accord with the initial philosophy--that the underlying function of the Center was improving instruction on the university campus. The extension of this principle to improving instruction in the public schools as well was readily accepted, though no official action was ever taken. Somehow the instructional program, like the Center itself, grew a bit like "Topsy," although not without a calculated plan. Its steady development was suddenly jarred, however, with the advent of the NDEA Fellowship program.

In 1960 a friend in the MST Contracts Office inquired why we had not applied for Fellowship monies as a number of other departments on campus were already doing. Thus prompted into action, the Director immediately made the necessary application and within a fairly short time grants were received for four doctoral fellowships. At this point, the College of Education Curriculum Committee was suddenly galvanized into action. It was discovered that we had a doctoral program being funded for fellowships by the federal government, when, in fact, no such program officially existed. This created quite a stir and some consternation. All was resolved, however, with the help of the excellent relationships which had been built up within the College of Education and around the university, so that in almost record time a Doctoral program was approved both by the College of Education and the University Curriculum Committee. Announcements of the Fellowships were sent out nationwide in the Spring of 1960, and by that Fall four doctoral candidates were officially enrolled in the program. This Fellowship Program continued for several years.

The Doctoral Fellowship Program in Instructional Technology provided a big boost to our advanced graduate program at Michigan State University. The wide publicity attendant with the nationwide announcement resulted in a few of the more qualified and experienced applicants "shopping around" at several of the institutions having such programs (notably USC and Syracuse) before making a decision on which bid to accept. This was basically healthy, in that it provided a kind of focus upon program quality that benefited all participants and also indirectly generated added administrative support at MSU for the establishment of needed new positions. Further, the Fellowship students provided an essential corps of top-notch students and a morale that helped to attract others coming primarily on their own resources. At the same time several other developments were occurring which helped to enhance the overall program at MSU.

Brazil Project

Through a series of fortuitous events, a contract was arranged between the Agency for International Development (AID), the Brazilian Ministry of Education, and Michigan State University. This program had as its underlying purpose "bringing the benefits of audiovisual education to the school systems of Brazil." Without going into the details of the project beyond saying that it was highly successful in spite of being cut off after four years by a change of presidential administration in Washington, there were a number of highly positive results for the overall MSU program:

1. Key staff members received the broadening experience of working overseas in a developing country. Dr. Horace Hartsell, Associate Director of the Center at MSU, served as Chief of Party from 1960-62; Dr. James Page from 1962-64; Professor Edward McCoy, Head of Film Production, served as Chief of Film Production for the Brazil Project, and Dr. Charles F. Schuller, the Project Director, made five trips to Brazil for periods of several weeks to two months during the four years.

Several other MSU personnel, including Dr. Armand Hunter, Head of Television and Broadcasting Services, Professor Wildred Veenendaal, Head of Graphics Division, and others went to Brazil as consultants with project responsibilities in their special areas.

2. The Brazil Project contributed to the visibility of the Instructional Media Center and its programs, both on and off campus. The Brazil contract was the first major contract in a series of federal and other grants over the next 14 years which totaled in excess of $8,500,000. The prestige created by such grants within the university administration, plus the monies made available for graduate assistantships and other residual benefits because of savings in salaries resulting from the grants, unquestionably were major influences in the growth of the IMC and graduate program. The resulting administrative recognition and support on campus for IMC programs was reflected in such practical terms as new positions and budgetary increases. It contributed, as well, to national awareness of MSU's academic program and helped stimulate applications for advanced graduate study over an extended period of time.

3. A part of the Brazil Project called for bringing selected media professionals to the United States for graduate work. The bulk of these came to Michigan State University, thus further enhancing the enrollment in our graduate programs in media--as well as our reputation in international programs, numerous students from other countries came to MSU for advanced work in Instructional Media and Technology.

In addition, over time, many of our IMC staff members became involved in project or teaching assignments in other areas, such as Nigeria, Pakistan, Far Eastern countries, Western Europe and Iran.

The Educational Development Program (EDP)

As in most successful developments in mankind's institutions, be they in business and industry

or in social institutions such as higher education, a variety of factors are normally involved. Some of these can be ascribed to leadership and good planning; others, including the coming together of a number of powerful factors at just the right point in time, can only be ascribed to fortuitous circumstances. So it was with the Educational Development Program at MSU and its impact upon IMC organization and graduate training programs.

The reader may recall that when establishing the Media Center in 1952, the new director secured agreement that the underlying function of the Center was to improve instruction. This seemingly obvious "given" was by no means universally held in those early days, when audiovisual service units tended to be regarded somewhat on a par with such agencies as electric shops, sign shops and bookstores. The difference, of course, lay in the fact that, aside from the purely technical positions in graphics, sound, film, and photography, the individuals heading these units, in addition to their specialities, had to be essentailly **teacher-educators.** On that basis it became possible to pull together the outstanding professional staff to which much of the credit for the later developing eminence of MSU's academic program properly belongs. Some staff have already been noted in the description of the Brazil Project. Other notables include: Dr. Paul W. F. Witt, who came to MSU in 1967 after 24 years in a similar position at Teachers College, Columbia University, and who assumed a primary role in our academic programs and as our chief liaison with the College of Education; and Professor Floyde E. Brooker, former Head of the Audiovisual Branch in the International Cooperation Administration (ICA)--as well as former Executive Secretary to the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (DAVI) of the NEA. Among others who have distinguished themselves on the MSU/IMC staff for varying periods were: Dr. John Barson, formerly of Wayne State University, who headed two pioneer benchmark studies on Instructional Development; Dr. James Nord, formerly with the Oregon State System of Higher Education, Division of Teaching Research; and Dr. Castelle Gentry, formerly of the University of Toledo, Syracuse University and the University of Maine.

Origins of Instructional Development at MSU

It was at the first Okoboji National Audiovisual Leadership Conference, in 1955, that the senior author first heard the concept of Instructional Systems discussed. It was at an informal after-dinner get-together of several people, including Dr. Charles Hoban of the University of Pennsylvania, Floyde Brooker, then Executive Secretary of DAVI, and others. Charlie Hoban suggested the possibility of applying systems principles derived from engineering to the instructional process as a broader base for more appropriate employment of audiovisual materials in instruction. The idea caught on and the following year, at the second Okoboji Conference, Dr. Hoban gave the keynote address, which he entitled "A Systems Approach to Audiovisual Communications."

Several years later the writer sought and received a grant from the U. S. Office of Education for a Demonstration and Evaluation Project in Instructional Systems Development. Dr. John Barson was brought in in 1962 to head up this project, which involved, besides MSU, Syracuse University, the University of Colorado, and San Francisco State College.

Even though relatively little was known at that time about applying a systems approach to instruction, all four institutions were keenly interested, and undertook, each in its own way, to apply and test the efficiency of the concept. The project ran from 1963 to 1965 and the final report was published in 1967. To the writer's knowledge this was the first formal project on instructional development (ID) in any American university. While the findings were not dramatic, a good deal of experience was gained from the efforts of these four institutions, much of which was applied in some of their own graduate programs and provided the basis for future efforts in instructional development. It was at this point that graduate training at MSU began to include ID as well as media.

Establishment of EDP at Michigan State University

Like most other major universities during the early '60s, MSU was suffering from burgeoning enrollments, a shortage of faculty, limited resources, and the effects of the "explosion of knowledge" which was changing the dimensions of many content-areas of the university curriculum. Under the leadership of Dr. John Hannah, President of MSU, with a grant of $440,000 from the Ford Foundation, an experimental program was launched in 1964 in educational development for undergraduate education. Fortunately, an outstanding scholar/administrator by the name of Dr. John Dietrich was named to organize and head up the EDP program.

One of the important developments of the EDP program was a reorganization of media facilities on the campus, resulting in the concentration of all of those relating to instruction falling under the direction of the Provost--the highest academic office in the university. An important aspect of this reorganization was that closed-circuit television, then being used exclusively for instructional purposes, was shifted administratively from Broadcast Television into the Instructional Media Center program. At that point, Dr. Erling Jorgensen, formerly with the Midwest Program in Airborne Television Instruction (MPATI), was brought in as part of the IMC staff. Under his direction, some 150 classrooms on campus were equipped for receiving closed-circuit television, and many of these rooms were used for multiple sections of large courses offered for all freshmen and sophomores through the University College.

There had been much concern before this program was launched that students might object to receiving instruction through CCTV and numerous steps were taken to minimize such possible negative effect. One of these steps was the careful development of the courses themselves so that they were more than the "talking faces" of lecturers. Another was to supply graduate student monitors in each of the sections for purposes of answering questions and providing needed clarification. A third step, with the help of the Evaluation Service, careful studies were made of both student achievement and student attitudes toward use of the medium for substantial segments of their instruction in those courses. These studies revealed: (1) that student achievement was at least as good as under the old large lecture-hall system formerly in effect, and (2) that while students preferred a live lecture to a televised one, that preference was more than offset by: (a) the convenience of having their instruction in dormitory classrooms rather than somewhere across campus, (b) the possibility of having repeat telecasts of the same lesson in case some were missed, and (c) regular meetings with assistance to clear up questions, take tests, and generally to keep closer track of individual progress than was normally the case in large lecture sessions.

The Educational Development Program encompassed much more, of course, than simply changing formats and making instruction more rapidly accessible to students. An important part of the original project was the provision of funds to support faculty experimentation on approved projects and to free instructors time to engage in these studies. Further expert assistance was provided within the framework of the systems approach to improve the quality of instruction in various colleges and departments across campus.

An important part of the EDP organization was the Learning Service, headed initially by Dr. Robert Davis, a specialist in learning psychology and instructional design. Some years later, when Dr. Dietrich took over other responsibilities in the Office of the Provost, Dr. Davis became Assistant Provost for Learning Resources. He assumed responsibility for the IMC and EDP, and established a much closer relationship with the University Evaluation Services. Dr. Larry Alexander was then appointed to head up the Learning Service.

Readers interested in a more thorough analysis of instructional development of the EDP at Michigan State are referred to the publication "Commitment to Excellence--A Case Study of Educational Innovation," by Robert H. Davis, Allan J. Abedor, and Paul W. F. Witt, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1976.

UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY (UCIDT)[1]

In 1964 Dr. James Finn (USC), Dr. Donald Ely of Syracuse, and Dr. Schuller created a university consortium--in conjunction with the Special Media Institutes program which had been established under the old NDEA Title III to provide special training institutes in media for classroom teachers in various subject areas.

The National Office for the Special Media Institutes (SMI) Project as well as for the Consortium was located at USC under Dr. Finn's direction. Following his untimely death in 1969, the Office of Education required that the headquarters for the project be relocated. At the urging of his colleagues in the Consortium, Dr. Schuller accepted the Directorship and the National Office was moved to Michigan State University.

At about this time, the National Special Media Institutes had essentially run their course. An independent evaluation survey contracted by USOE concluded that the program had been effective with the some 600 teachers who had participated across the country, although its overall impact in bringing innovation and change to education was limited. Something broader was needed. The vehicle ultimately chosen by USOE was instructional development.

During the middle to late '60s the EDP program at MSU was rather remarkably successful. It was reasoned in USOE that if such a program could be successfully developed in a university with all of its inherent constraints and conservatism, an appropriate program for the public schools held promise of being equally if not more successful. So a new federal contract was arranged with the Consortium for training teams of teachers, administrators, curriculum and other specialists, and school board members in the principles and operation of instructional development programs for the public schools. After tryout and revisions in four major cities, and the selection and training of teams in some 20 states to put on the Instructional Development Institutes (IDIs), some 350 to 400 IDIs were conducted in school systems across the United States during the period from 1971-1974. The impact was indeed substantial.

For our purposes here, however, the point is twofold. First, the intensity and thoroughness with which the IDI model and the training materials for

---

[1] The original members of the Consortium were Michigan State University, Syracuse University and the University of Southern California. The Teaching Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education joined a few months later. Indiana University became a member in 1971 and Florida State University in 1978. Inquiries about the Consortium and the Instructional Development Institute (now in its third major revision) should be addressed to:

Dr. Donald Ely, National Director
Area of Instructional Technology
130 Huntington Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13210

its implementation were designed, developed, evaluated and revised has probably never been equaled. In consequence, large numbers of staff members and graduate students at the four Consortium institutions became relatively expert in a short period of time on the practices as well as the principles of effective instructional development. Second, the benefits of this rare and remarkable phenomenon are readily apparent today in the work being carried on across the country by literally hundreds of recipients of advanced degrees from the Consortium institutions. Recent surveys also indicate that these materials continue to be used in a large number of graduate programs outside the Consortium.

Curriculum Development in Instructional Technology

The impact of the IDI's upon graduate programs in this field has, of course, been profound and pervasive. Early in the game, Consortium staff members began using segments of the IDI in their courses. The same was doubtless true of training teams from other institutions. For a number of years the Consortium institutions put on IDI's for their own faculty and graduate students. Later, individual modules, or parts of modules, came into use in advanced graduate seminars or other courses as appropriate.

There seems little question that the advent of systems in instructional design helped to spell out the demise of the long-respected term "Audiovisual." It is interesting to note, for example, that the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools was using the following definition of instructional technology in the early 1970s:

> "Instructional Technology is the combination of human and non-human resources employed in a systematic way in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the total process of learning and teaching....It links the human resources of instruction/information networks which include materials and machines for print, audiovisual media, television and radio, amplified telephone, learning laboratories, the computer, games and simulation, and teaching machines."

The first course offered at Michigan State in the early '50s was entitled "Audiovisual Materials in Teaching and Learning." This course was designed primarily for in-service teachers and focussed upon the selection and effective use of various types of AV materials in school situations. (Similar courses are still being taught for graduate students.) Several years later, a course called "Audiovisual Instruction," on a more elementary level, was provided for undergraduate juniors and seniors preparing to become teachers. During the later '50's a course in AV Administration was also offered for people working on a Master's degree or desiring to prepare for a position in the AV field. The balance of course work for the Master's candidates (and the majority of course work for Doctoral candidates) was focussed upon curriculum, educational psychology, administration and other areas of particular interest or need for the individual student.

With the addition, in the early '60s, of the instructional development emphasis at Michigan State and the advent of an official Doctoral Program in Instructional Technology, we began offering courses and seminars on instructional development in higher education. Also, at this point, with the help of Dr. David Berlo, Chairman of the Department of Communications, a series of courses in communication, the adoption of innovation and change, and a particularly good sequence of courses in statitstics and research design were incorporated into the doctoral program. By the early '70s, in keeping with events described earlier, there was an increased focus upon instructional development in practically all courses. A staff curriculum committee for professional programs was established which carefully examined the entire program of course and seminar offerings for both professional preparation courses for majors and service courses for teachers. Out of this continuing sifting and winnowing of the knowledge resulting from rapid changes occurring in the field, a series of broadened course-offerings was designed which incorporated all components of the ID process but which retained media as a necessary part of most delivery systems. During this period, the official title of the graduate program was appropriately changed to Instructional Development and Technology (ID&T).

PART II
THE PRESENT - WHAT WE ARE

Now that we have examined the origins of the academic program at MSU we will examine its current status. As indicated earlier, the program was initiated by Dr. Schuller, who was head of the IMC. However, its academic home was and continues to be in the College of Education. The program was nurtured and grew due to the interest and efforts of the IMC staff, but over time the College began to provide funds for faculty support. The IMC's major influence on the program was due simply to the fact that the impetus for continued growth and support would need to be shifted more and more to the College of Education.

The transition was gradual and evolutionary, based upon a recognition by all concerned that its strength should be maintained throughout the process. Everyone wished to insure the strength of the program and protect its national and international stature. Due to his heavy commitments in other areas, Dr. Schuller had named Dr. Witt as head of the academic program, and he and Professor Veenendall played key roles in facilitating a smooth transition. Both assumed active roles in

the College of Education governance, including sitting on its highest-ranking committee (Academic Council) and serving as coordinators of the program in Instructional Development and Technology. Upon the retirement of Dr. Witt, followed a year later by the return of Professor Veenendall, Dr. Gentry assumed the coordinator's role for the Program.

Today, faculty from the program sit upon virtually all of the college's committees and several university committees. One now chairs the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and another is a member of the Executive Committee and Council. The College Curriculum Committee includes at the university level a faculty member from the program and the six-member University Committee on Instructional Computing includes an Instructional Development and Technology faculty member. The complete list of committee assignments is quite lengthy, but the reader should now have gathered that committee activity is now much more time-consuming for Instructional Development and Technology faculty members than in the past. Another way of saying it, is that we have been "institutionalized." The issue is not simply economics, however, since College policies and procedures now more heavily influence program operation and future direction than had formerly been the situation.

Thus we arrive at the present status of the academic program. Faculty members for the program are now drawn from a variety of units within the university. As of 1980 there are no faculty members who have a full-time teaching responsibility, although three are completely supported by College of Education funds. While only one faculty member is shared with the IMC, there has been an increase in the number of faculty members shared with the research and development units in the university's two colleges of medicine. Also, the College of Education has increased its percentage of support for a number of ID&T faculty members. Thus, the total number of faculty members has not changed significantly, but its composition is considerably different than in the beginning. Further, there is a wider range of support and field experiences now available to students.

The basic media courses in the ID&T curriculum continue to be offered and attract both majors and non-majors. However, no courses in production and management have been added in recent years. New additions to the curriculum reflect the other interests and activities of the faculty. For example, recent additions include a course in functioning as an instructional development consultant, another in diffusion of educational innovations and a third in developing instructional products for business and industry.

As indicated earlier, the nature of faculty activity expanded over time from an initial focus upon "audiovisual" to that of instructional development. Naturally the academic program expanded its content to parallel these changes. As the Educational Development Program came into being along with extensive instructional development activities, the academic program evolved along comparable lines. It is fair to say that the training of graduate students has to a large degree been a mirror of the growth of instructional improvement activities on the MSU campus. This continues to be the case as faculty development and organizational development have become an added thrust towards educational improvement at MSU. These new thrusts have not replaced the concern for providing students with skills in media and instructional development, but rather are additional elements which reflect current developments in the field. Hence, the number of course offerings has continued to grow, and now consumes a large portion of each student's total program than in the past.

The Learning and Evaluation Services (L&ES), which is the campus-wide ID agency, has expanded its activities to include both faculty development and organizational development. In earlier years, L&ES devoted much of its effort to instructional development projects, most of which had major media design/development components. Currently, however, L&ES devotes much of its resources to faculty development by conducting workshops for faculty members upon a variety of topics such as student evaluation, faculty evaluation, objectives writing and media production. Consequently, the half-dozen ID&T students holding assistantships in L&ES have considerable exposure to and experience in conducting faculty workshops, but less than formerly in instructional development. The L&ES also has an organizational development (OD) specialist, who spends much of his time conducting workshops on OD topics and working directly with faculty members and administrators. Typical concerns of the OD effort are: improving comunication among administrators, faculty members and students; raising faculty morale; and establishing a climate for innovation. Thus, the L&ES staff who teach our courses have refocussed some of their research and writing interests, which in turn has affected the content of their courses.

The three ID&T faculty members who are shared with the university's two medical schools also do little of what traditionally would be called instructional development. One is heavily involved in a major long-term faculty development project which includes recruiting, orienting and training practicing physicians to assume faculty positions. Another is conducting research on, and developing certification examination procedures for, a medical specialty. The third administers a curriculum development center. This is not to suggest that no faculty members have instructional development responsibilities. A number of faculty members continue to provide these services, including one in the IMC, two with campus-wide television services and one who directs a learning resources center for the College of Education.

The ID&T faculty have always shown a great deal of interest in international projects and in students from other countries. It is interesting to

note that the largest international projects occurred a number of years ago and resulted in many opportunities for faculty members to work in other cultures. However, these projects did not result in a major influx of foreign students. More recently, the size and scope of international projects conducted by the ID&T faculty is smaller, but the number of requests for admission to the program from other countries have increased. At the present time about 20 percent of the ID&T student body is from other countries, though only a few are from any one place. The ID&T faculty have always been concerned that we not have a high concentration of students from any one country, and so have not solicited projects which would require such an arrangement. The increased number of foreign students has considerably broadened the perspective of both faculty members and students, and in general the results have been positive. However, the wider range of cultural and educational backgrounds increases the burden of the faculty when attempting to select relevant instructional examples and to provide appropriate field experiences. We have heard from some colleagues at other institutions that their students often either don't go home or don't stay there, but informal feedback from our graduates suggests the opposite. We plan to conduct a follow-up study of all graduates within the next year and will then be in a better position to judge the impact of our program upon instructional technology in other countries.

As noted earlier, cooperative efforts with other instructional technology academic programs, especially through the University Consortium for Instructional Development and Technology (UCIDT), have always been a hallmark of the MSU program. Today, some 16 years after its inception, the Consortium continues to affect and be affected by MSU. It has expanded its membership to include other major graduate programs, and regularly offers in-service workshops for professionals in the field. It is interesting to note that the Consortium also evolved from an intital focus upon special media institutes to its current focus upon instructional development. This transition parallels the changes which have occurred in the academic program at MSU. It is fair to say that while MSU has had a profound effect upon the Consortium, so has the Consortium had a profound effect upon MSU. It continues to be an important source of professional growth and renewal for MSU and we expect the relationship to continue.

Job placement has always been a major strength of ID&T at MSU. Defying the trend in education toward fewer jobs available and more students seeking them, we continue to place all our graduates in "appropriate" types of professional positions. The term "appropriate" is deliberately placed in quotes to highlight a significant change which has occurred in placement (and later job mobility) of our graduates in the last few years.

During the early years, almost all Doctoral graduates of the program sought and attained positions in higher education, while most Master's students entered public education. Many of those entering higher education became faculty members and assumed primarily teaching roles. In fact, a number of well-known instructors in instructional technology departments around the country are MSU alumni. Another major role for earlier graduates was to teach and engage in instructional development in higher educational institutions. Those in public education usually became administrators of media programs.

But a few years ago we noticed a change in placement patterns. Some new graduates, and some not-so-new alumni, began to take positions in a variety of other settings. At first, the pattern was unclear, and was limited to a few people. Later it became more evident that a definite trend was occurring, with an ever-increasing number of people taking positions in business, industry, commerical enterprises and governmental or quasi-governmental agencies. At first we attributed this emerging placement pattern to a decreased demand in education. However, we have since determined that, although reduced demand in education was a contributing factor, of more importance was an increased demand in other settings. This trend has been confirmed by colleagues in other institutions, and is even more apparent in some of the graduate programs in urban universities which are closer to the industrial market. In fact, the demand in business and industry for graduates seems to be increasing at a much faster rate than we can expect to supply. The challenging positions, financial rewards and career-growth opportunities in these new areas are extensive and promise to have a profound effect upon our graduates, our academic program and our entire profession in the future.

On this note, it is appropriate to conclude our consideration of the present status of the program and look to what the future may hold. Our philosophy remains the same - to promote the widespread intelligent application of instructional development and technology to the educational problems and opportunities of our world. But our definition of educational problems and opportunities has expanded as the world around us has changed. Education is no longer the exclusive nor even the primary domain of schools. As more and more education moves out of the school, instructional technology must necessarily follow. The last part of this chapter is devoted to speculating upon what the future holds in terms of needed curriculum change and new instructional delivery systems.

PART III
THE FUTURE — WHERE ARE WE GOING?

To look into the future is perhaps the most difficult activity of all. History teaches us that our ability to predict is often quite accurate in the short run, but quite inaccurate for the longer term. By simply projecting current trends we can predict selected short-term conditions with confidence.

However, rapidly emerging physical, electronic and behavioral technology makes us much less certain of other predictions.

We must also keep in mind that we as a profession are **part** of a larger society; we do not stand **apart** from it. We both influence and are influenced, we change and are changed, we contribute and we receive. From this rather humble perspective we offer the following estimates of what the future may hold, not just for professional education at MSU, but for the profession-at-large.

Our discussion is divided into two sections: (1) where will the new knowledge in our profession come from, and (2) how will we (at MSU) probably deliver it?

New Knowledge Sources

As we enter the decade of the '80s, the traditional knowledge sources appear to be altering in importance. From an intellectual standpoint, the majority of our information in the past came from the physical sciences (electronic and photographic devices), psychology (learning theory), communications (communication theory) and engineering (general systems theory). Although these areas will continue to supply useful information, it seems likely that management, business administration, biology, and political science may become major sources of useful new concepts and principles. An example is the research on hemispheric dominance, which may have major implications for how we organize and deliver instruction.

Current and future high technology is also breeding more complex formal and informal organizations. In order to have impact, we must become even more adept at understanding and being able to modify increasingly-complex organizations and successfully interacting with the people within them. Otherwise we will become the technicians while someone else determines the direction. Social psychology and political science should be of value as we attempt to deal with these issues. Likewise, management and business administration will become more central concerns as we are pushed to become more efficient and productive in both creating and operating education and training systems of proven effectiveness.

The point should not be lost that these "added" disciplines often rely upon what we may consider unconventional methods and means for creating and applying their knowledge. Thus we will need to broaden both our perspectives and our skills if we are to gain from and contribute knowledge in these areas. This is not to suggest that the more traditional sources of new information will lose their importance. Rather, it means we must be alert to developments in an ever wider range of disciplines than in the past.

How We Will Deliver Knowledge

It is safe to predict that over time our delivery systems will also change. Not because universities like to change, but because we will be forced to change. Forging new alliances with colleagues in other disciplines will be of high priority. Our students will need to be self-schooled in management and in the nature of organizations, and to accomplish this we must rely upon others. Unfortunately, we will not be able just to simply send our students to them for "treatment." Rather, we will need to be actively involved in developing a curriculum based upon knowledge in those areas which are relevant to our students. This activity is analogous to what was done in the past with psychology and communications (i.e., helping them define what is of interest to us).

Our clientele will change. As the cost of education rises and employment opportunities in our field abound, we will probably see fewer full-time students. Distance learning, part-time arrangements and cycles of education and work will become more common. Numerous current requirements,such as residency and class-contact hours, will need to be reexamined. Both faculty members and students will need to become adept at operating in a variety of instructional settings.

More specialization of programs will probably occur with perhaps less emphasis upon degrees. We expect more students to come back for short-term "re-treading" on a periodic basis, not for a degree, but to acquire needed new competencies. International students will continue to find the program attractive and may become the primary source of full-time students. (The implications of having primarily foreign students available for on-campus assistantships are many, but are beyond the scope of this chapter.)

All of the above forces will place new burdens upon the faculty to acquire additional skills and to engage in continuous redevelopment of the curriculum, while re-defining our relationships with students. Unfortunately, we will probably not be in a position to hire new faculty members as the university comes under increasing pressure to curtail expenditures and adapt to tight times for at least a few years. Lack of new faculty members and reduced budgets for development signal a decade of extreme challenge to the profession.

The most critical issue for the future has been reserved for last. We in the profession must come to grips with what may be one of the greatest issues of our time--productivity. Our society has been built upon employing its technology to gain efficiency and productivity. The country has grown and prospered and we enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world because we have used a vast array of physical, electronic and human technologies to steadily increase our over-all efficiency. However, as of 1980, we seemed to have reached a plateau. For six successive quarters our national economy has experienced a decline in real productivity. This appears not to be simply a statistical aberration, but rather signals some fundamental flaws in our economy. While it would be gratuitous to assume

that instructional technology can identify and remedy all of these flaws, it is nonetheless reasonable to expect that it can make a contribution. In industry, one obvious area is assisting in the development of more efficient and effective training programs which shorten training time while increasing worker competence. In the education sector, we must face the issue of whether we can (and are willing to publicly state) that instruction can be made more efficient. Most of our efforts to date have been directed at effectiveness, but the time seems ripe to make a bold step and strike out in pursuit of increasing productivity by accomplishing more with less. We, as a still somewhat primitive technology, have not really addressed ourselves to these concerns. It is time for us to make an active thrust and attempt to demonstrate that instructional technology can increase productivity in a wide variety of settings. Concentrating upon effectiveness has brought us a long way, but if we hope to scale the next height, productivity provides the ladder.

Conclusion

The professional preparation program at MSU, which began as a single AV course, has developed and evolved into a large and comprehensive program in instructional technology. Each step was taken through the dedicated efforts of both faculty members and students. We are what we are because of our close association with the university's instructional improvement agencies. We remain committed to improving instruction, but now include settings far from the campus. Our commitment is to train service professionals who will assist others to do better what really needs to be done. Our focus is pragmatic and our style eclectic. We are action-oriented, as were our audiovisual forefathers. But we recognize that the world is changing and hence we are also changing. We are optimistic about the future, but recognize that our resources are limited, while the demands upon our energies are increasing. Nonetheless, we are committed to building and growing on the basis of our proud heritage.